DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 908 CG 017 165

AUTHOR Romero, Dan; And Others
TITLE Teaching Ethnic Psychology to Undergraduates: Course Development, Delivery, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; American Indians; Asian Americans; Blacks; *Course Content; *Course Evaluation; *Curriculum Development; Educational Innovation; *Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; Professional Education; Program Descriptions; *Psychology; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the development, delivery, and evaluation of university undergraduate courses in ethnic psychology, which is defined as research and literature about four major racial/ethnic minority groups, Asian American/Pacific Islanders, Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans. Following a brief history of the role of professional psychology in addressing ethnic issues, especially the actions of the American Psychological Association (APA), research on the current status of ethnic psychology courses nationwide, is presented. An undergraduate ethnic psychology course offered in the fall of 1982 is described including format, course requirements and grade assignments (a list of presenters is included in the appendix). Issues in course delivery are addressed (e.g., student reactions, course content, assessment and grading), and characteristics of students enrolled in the course are described. Students' evaluations of the course and instructors' evaluations of students are also discussed. Six detailed recommendations dealing with organizational, departmental, and faculty and student roles in undergraduate ethnic psychology courses complete the paper. (MCF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237908

Teaching Ethnic Psychology to Undergraduates: Course Development, Delivery, and Evaluation

Dan Romero
Counseling Center
University of California, Irvine

Leslie B. Minor
Program in Social Ecology
University of California, Irvine

Christine C. Iijima Hall
California College of Medicine
University of California, Irvine

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dan Romero

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 017165

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of
The American Psychological Association, Anaheim, California
August 26-30, 1983

Running head: Undergraduate Ethnic Psychology
For draft purposes only. For reference citation, please contact senior author

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this presentation is to discuss salient issues in the development, delivery, and evaluation of university undergraduate courses in ethnic psychology. Ethnic psychology involves psychological research and literature that examines the needs of Asian Americans, Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans. The presentation focuses on four related concerns in the teaching of undergraduate ethnic psychology courses. First, a historical perspective and informal data on the status of ethnic psychology courses across the country establishes the need for creating courses. Second, the paper details development of one innovative undergraduate course in ethnic psychology. Next, issues in course delivery, including course content, meeting student needs, and assessing course and student evaluation are presented. Finally, characteristics of students enrolled in the initial offering of the course, student evaluation of the course, grading procedures and outcomes are detailed. Recommendations for creation and development of undergraduate ethnic psychology courses and suggestions for improvement of specific course format are included.

During the past decade Psychology as a profession has been increasingly concerned with its ability to attract and retain sufficient numbers of ethnic/racial bicultural psychologists in the professional pipeline. Taylor (1977) believes the under-representation of ethnic/racial psychologists has serious implications for the credibility and utility of developments within psychology. He has stated that when racial/ethnic psychologists are not involved in asking questions, developing hypotheses, and interpreting data, the outcomes may be skewed because the entire range of the possible may not be considered.

Russo, Olmedo, Stapp, and Fulcher (1981) surveyed the number of culturally distinct professionals and students in psychology and reported that 3% of 45,000 members of the American Psychological Association (APA) are members of ethnic/racial groups. They further report that when the pipeline to APA membership is viewed in terms of doctoral recipients and graduate students, the picture remains bleak. The percentage of ethnic/racial doctoral recipients in psychology has remained stable, around 7%, between 1977 and 1980, according to Russo and his colleagues (1981). Unpublished figures reported by the National Board on Graduate Education (1976) estimate the percentage of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American students awarded Bachelor degrees in psychology as 7.4%. Clearly at all levels, racial/ethnic psychologists and students are far under-represented percentagewise when compared to representation in the nation's total population of 48,000,000 - approximately 16%. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980). Unless innovative actions are undertaken in the 1980's the situation will be increased national growth of ethnic/racial group representation in the population and decreased growth in corresponding representation within the profession of psychology.

The purpose of this paper is to examine one area, undergraduate psychology curriculum, that must receive critical attention as the profession struggles to evolve an ethnic/racial perspective that will improve access to the professional pipeline for ethnic/racial groups. The paper is divided into four related sections. First, the paper reviews historical developments over the past twenty years that call for assessment within the profession for the role of culturally distinct people. A need for undergraduate coursework in ethnic psychology will be presented as well as current status of courses nationally. Second, the paper outlines the development and delivery of one specific undergraduate course in ethnic psychology. A third component discusses operational issues related to course delivery. A final component surveys characteristics of students enrolled in the class and discusses student evaluation of the course.

Historical Perspective and the Need for Ethnic Psychology Courses

Historically, over the past two decades a ten-year cycle of concern emerges, as professional psychology has attempted to meet the needs of the culturally different. The first cycle began in 1963 with the creation by APA of an Ad Hoc Committee on Equal Opportunity in Psychology. A major charge of the Committee was to study the plight of Black psychologists as reported by Albee (1969). For example, statistics gathered from ten major departments of psychology identified eight Ph.D.'s granted to Black candidates from a total of more than 3500 in the period between 1920 and 1965. The first cycle features creation of ethnic-specific associations of psychologists and stirring debate about APA's responsiveness to ethnic psychology needs, (Simpkins & Rafael, 1970).

A benchmark for the second cycle was the 1973 Vail Conference called to review levels and patterns of professional training in psychology. According to Hilliard (1976) a major theme that pervaded conference discussions involved issues of training and education for ethnic minorities. A number of recommendations were

proposed, involving expanded professional training about ethnic/racial issues, including the idea that doing therapy or counseling without sensitivity to cultural differences was unethical. A related, but not often reported recommendation by Conference ethnic minority participants, stated they were not satisfied with the number of minority undergraduates available for training in professional psychology. Further, participants believed that without satisfactory affirmative action progress to increase the number of ethnic minority students in psychology programs, teaching faculty who are APA members should be subject to review by the APA Ethics Committee for unethical practices in teaching (Korman, 1976). While not extremely specific, the concern for meeting the needs of ethnic/racial constituents has been reaffirmed in the Ethical Principles of Psychologists (American Psychological Association, 1981) whereby "Psychologists recognize differences among people .... when necessary they obtain training, experience, or counsel to assure competent service or research relating to such persons". Competent services to graduate or undergraduate students who enroll in classes can only be achieved if cultural issues, research, and trends are addressed in the curriculum.

The second cycle, between 1973-1983, featured an intensive effort to establish the importance of a minority perspective at APA, and within psychology departments across the country. In 1974 APA established a Minority Fellowship Program designed to increase the pool of qualified ethnic/racial providers of psychological services (Jones, 1980; Taylor 1977). The Dulles Conference in 1978 further examined ways to expand roles of culturally distinct people in psychology and further documented the need for ethnic content in psychology courses (Sue, 1983). The Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs (BEMA) was created in 1981 with a major charge to increase the quality and quantity of educational training opportunities for ethnic/racial persons in psychology. An excellent review of historical developments to improve psychology's responsiveness to ethnic minorities during this cycle has recently been completed (Casas, in press).

Throughout the past ten-year cycle attention has been focused on the status of minority students in graduate training programs with an almost exclusive concentration on clinical programs (Boxley and Wagner, 1971; Kennedy and Wagner, 1979), counseling programs (Parham and Moreland 1981) and minority training and curricula in clinical graduate programs (Bernal and Padilla, 1982). Little attention has been focused on the development and delivery of seminars on ethnic psychology at the graduate level (Ramirez, 1979), or coursework for undergraduates. For the purpose of clarity, ethnic psychology refers to a substantial body of psychological research and literature about four major racial/ethnic minority groups, including Asian American/Pacific Islanders, Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans. Ethnic psychology thus defined should not be confused with cross-cultural psychology often offered at universities and having a more international focus and flavor. Ramirez (1979) believes the body of knowledge in ethnic psychology has major ethical, theoretical and methodological implications for the field of psychology.

A third cycle will commence during 1983. The third cycle will target more specific efforts at integrating the organizational structure at APA and impacting curriculum in psychology departments as recently outlined by BEMA's report by the Task Force on Minority Educational Training (American Psychological Association, Note 1). A major thrust of this paper is to advance the idea that in the third cycle psychology departments must examine and upgrade course offerings that present ethnic psychology to undergraduates.

A focus on ethnic psychology at the undergraduate level is essential for several compelling reasons. Undergraduate psychology courses are often taken by the non-psychology major for a breadth requirement and unless <u>all</u> courses focus their content on cultural issues, non-majors can have a skewed view of the world.

Without exposure to ethnic psychology issues, they make assumptions that do not recognize differences among people. Other students may not confront their stereotypic beliefs about ethnic/racial people. A vast number of psychology undergraduate majors will never attend graduate school and may never be exposed to material that will allow them to understand and respond to the needs of culturally different people they may work with on the job. In general, undergraduates represent a larger, more diverse group of students than graduate students and must have knowledge of cultural differences to have a more sophisticated understanding of the world.

As stated previously, the teaching of ethnic psychology at the undergraduate level has not been a priority over the past ten years. Sporadic courses have appeared at only a handful of colleges and universities. Little formal evidence has been gathered to survey the status of undergraduate ethnic psychology courses. A recent survey by APA's Educational Affairs Office highlights this difficulty (American Psychological Association, Note 2). In 1982 they telephone surveyed 100 undergraduate psychology department chairs about needs, problems, and issues facing undergraduate psychology education. Undergraduate curriculum was identified as a major issue by 65 chairs. The survey noted chairs reported the student body was becoming more diverse. One survey question asked whether there were courses that incorporate international content. More than half (56%) replied "no". Of "yes" responses, only six responded ethnic minorities was the focus of international course content.

A second project from the Educational Affairs Office reviewed the undergraduate curriculum from an intercultural perspective (American Psychological Association, Note 3). The project culminated in a booklet containing selected course syllabi that integrated cross cultural or international elements into the curriculum. Eighteen course titles appear in the booklet. A quick review shows only two are specifically focused on ethnic psychology as defined in this paper.

In order to focus more on ethnic psychology as defined for our purposes, two informal surveys were conducted. First, thirteen of the top psychology departments listed in the American Psychological Association Monitor for excellence in training (Cordes, 1983), were telephone surveyed and asked whether they had any graduate or undergraduate courses in ethnic/cross cultural psychology. Five departments (38.5%) had one undergraduate course available and five (38.5%) had a graduate course. Several of the courses, much like courses reported earlier, were primarily international in scope. Only one university reported more than one ethnic psychology course offered.

A second survey assessed ethnic psychology courses offered within a large multicampus university system. Course titles and descriptions presented in undergraduate catalogues from nine campuses in the system were reviewed. Psychology courses listing ethnic group research or a general focus on ethnic psychology were noted. Several courses described in the catalogue focused on specific topics or specific ethnic/racial groups. Only one course appeared to focus on research issues related to all of the targeted ethnic/racial groups. The course, "Minority Issues in Psychology" has been offered over the past three years. Both graduate and undergraduate components have been developed and the course enrolls 45-60 undergraduates. While only one course was described in the catalogue, other course offerings probably exist. They may appear as special topics or occasional seminars and not as regularly offered courses.

Other informal contact with several colleagues nationally revealed less than ten courses on ethnic psychology being taught at the undergraduate level. Perhaps a glaring concern beyond the lack of courses in ethnic psychology, is a lack of information about appropriate scope and range of course content and impact of the course upon students who enroll in the course.

In summary, courses in ethnic psychology that focus on targeted ethnic/racial groups in the United States do not appear to be a priority in the undergraduate curriculum. It appears for every course in ethnic psychology, there are five that focus on cross cultural international issues. These courses are highly appropriate and important in their own right but do not address the special and unique needs of culturally different Asian Americans, Black Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans. Some courses that focus on these populations may appear and depend on the ebb and flow of departmental funds, political activity of students or specialized faculty interests. The groups continue to be forgotten and ignored in the traditional psychology curriculum.

Developing and Delivering Undergraduate Courses in Ethnic Psychology

It is painfully clear that few psychology courses at the university undergraduate level provide culturally relevant information to students. The fact is particularly disturbing because college juniors and seniors who are members of targeted ethnic groups are never exposed to research and information about ethnic psychology that might motivate them to pursue advanced training in psychology. Equally disturbing as the plight of the ethnic sutdent is the plight of other students whose ethnic and cultural heritage may not be a focus of this particular course. These students are in need of information about cultural differences to dispell myths and stereotypes that apply to populations who see themselves as culturally distinct. Without a primary recognition of these differences and competent service to undergraduate students in the form of teaching of ethnic psychology, psychology professors are in potential violation of ethical standards of the profession.

Another factor that is painfully apparent to faculty academic advisors is that undergraduate students from cultural groups lack information about the wide range of subfields in psychology and therefore, do not apply to graduate schools or enter the profession in a variety of specialities. Data reported by Russo

and his colleagues (1981) reviewing APA doctoral membership in twenty major subfields in psychology shows only two subfields, psycholinguistics and community psychology have more than 5% subfield membership composed of racial/ethnic psychologists. More revealing in the data is that 45% of the twenty subfields have no Black male or female members, 35% of the subfields have no Hispanic representatives, 20% of the subfields have no Asian representation, and 55% of the subfields have no American Indian representatives. Ethnic minority psychologists, much like ethnic conclaves of people living in a barrio, are clustered and tracked into subfields of psychology at the professional doctoral level as clearly as secondary school ethnic students have been tracked into vocational segments of the school curriculum.

A major purpose of this particular course in ethnic psychology was an initial attempt to address both the concern for lack of courses and lack of student information about subfields of psychology. The course brought to campus distinguished psychologists who are Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Native American and who were employed outside the University within a 125-mile radius of campus. Each presenter lectured on the "state of the art" with regard to cultural issues in psychology, and with specific emphasis on some of their original research in dealing with ethnic concerns. Presenters had published research or obtained training in a number of psychology specialities, including clinical, community, counseling, developmental, educational, experimental, physiological, psycholinguistics, psychometrics, school, and social psychology. One of the joys of introducing guest lecturers was being able to make comments such as - "Today we have one of the six identified American Indian clinical psychologists in the country at the

doctoral level as our guest speaker", or - "Today we have one of the ten identified Chicanos in counseling psychology as our presenter". It was clear to all class members that each of the guest presenters was a special role model who provided expertise and consultation to students beyond resources available on campus. A list of presenters appears as Appendix A.

An important element in course development was the willingness for guest participants to provide up to eight hours of their time to travel to campus, deliver their lecture, and meet with instructors, students or interested faculty. When initial contact was made and the purpose of the course explained, guest lecturers almost immediately applauded the effort. Some were embarrassed that their department or other psychology departments had not offered a similar course before. No difficulty occurred in making schedules fit. Since the course was funded at the lowest lecturer rate at the University, guest participants received a small honorarium to cover travel expenses. The amount was substantially below an hourly consultation rate appropriate for the quality of presentations and qualification of speakers. Initially, when contact was made and honorarium discussed, almost to a person, responses were made that it was the quality of the concept and innovativeness of that class that was a major draw for consenting to participate.

To meet class needs, ten guest presenters were scheduled. In total, twelve potential participants were contacted. Those who were unable to participate quickly offered suggestions of others who might be available. Of the ten participants, the course instructor had no previous personal contact with half. Therefore, an important personal benefit for the instructor was a level of colleagual networking for the future. At the end of the course, following completion of course evaluations, supervisors or department chairs were contacted via letter to describe

the course, outline participation of one of their staff as guest lecturer, and recognize their contribution to the class.

A final observation about all guest speakers was that each sincerely enjoyed the class and interaction with undergraduate students. Moreover, each participant had a strong appreciation for their dual identity as a psychologist and as a culturally distinct person. Many talked freely about their personal life experiences in pursuing the doctorate. The class had a strong flavor for both the psychologist and the person.

The course involved a weekly three-hour seminar format and met weekly on Mondays from 4:00 P.M. - 7:00 P.M. during Fall 1982 Quarter at the University. The time was designed to be optimal for travel to and from the University to avoid freeway traffic. The original course enrollment was 47. Seven students dropped the course before the sixth week and final grades were assigned to 40 students.

Course requirements and grade assignment were based on three measures, including:

a. Attendance - Since an essential aspect of the class was contact with guest speakers, attendance for the ten sessions was monitored and comprised 30% of the final grade.

b. Term Paper - Each student selected a topic of interest that followed directly from topics generated from class lectures or from an interest in reviewing information from other specialities in psychology. Papers were approximately ten pages in length. Topics received prior instructor approval to control quality. The term paper was worth 35% of the final grade.

c. A 70-item multiple choice final examination, based on lectures and readings, was administered. The examination accounted for 35% of the final grade.

Because of the unique format of the course with guest speakers and the lack of an appropriate text, each guest was asked to submit appropriate readings for their presentation. The course included approximately 325 pages of readings from book chapters, published articles, and articles in press. With prior permission readings were made available to students in the library reserve room.

The role of the instructor for the course was to organize the course, attend lectures and interrelate diverse material, consult with students on paper and course material, develop the final examination and complete grading. In addition to coordinating the course, the instructor did talk about many of the subfields of psychology not represented in the course, described potential areas for research, and suggested various graduate programs for students to consider.

Issues in Course Delivery

At large research universities across the country, the population of ethnic/racial students at the undergraduate level is minimal and their exposure to ethnic issues in the curriculum is virtually nonexistent. Under-representation has recently been documented in various fields of study by Astin and his associates (Astin, Astin, Green, Kent, McNamara, and Williams, 1982) who conclude that under-representation increases from the freshman year to Baccalaureate recipients for each minority group relative to their representation in the college-age population. A number of complex variables impact the increase in under-representation as one moves from the freshman level to the Baccalaureate degree. One conclusion made by Astin and his associates is that under-representation originates in part because of the low levels of academic preparation among minority groups at the precollegiate level. Another factor undoubtedly contributing to the drop-out rate involves experiences ethnic/racial minority students have in the college classroom. Attention has been directed toward assessing ethnic/racial minority students' lack of preparation and documenting insensitivity in curriculum and university faculty. However, little has been done to understand the impact of day-to-day experiences in classrooms, and issues encountered in course delivery, on performance and motivation for ethnic/racial minority students. The issues relevant in this discussion focus on the content and clarity of the course as

an integrated whole, contact and consulting with students, and assessment methods for determining course grades.

Course Clarity and Content

This course was different from many others in that ten instructors delivered lectures rather than one. Speakers brought very different orientations, interests, and presentation styles to the course with virtually no overlap in information. Integrating course content became a challenge. One method used to summarize information was to highlight main points from which final examination questions were developed. A specific body of knowledge was identified that would form the basis of the final examination. This approach decreased student test anxiety and increased performance on the final examination.

Most students reported they appreciated the variety of presentations for several reasons. The most obvious was contact with psychologists who were discussing their current research results or important issues and trends in their respective fields. Students reported that several guest presenters stimulated ideas for their papers and also supplied additional resources or supplemental readings that were helpful in developing student papers. Students also reported they had a better understanding for the personality and lifestyle of the presenters. Typically, faculty might be more reluctant to disclose personal information in working with students at their respective university and department because the function of classroom interaction is usually viewed as imparting psychological information and not focusing upon the identity of the instructor. Finally, teaching styles varied and students reported they enjoyed contrasting learning from a presenter who might use an overhead projector, versus one who used the blackboard extensively with detailed outlines and others who mesmerized them with oral presentations. Future course offerings will outline learning how to learn, and contrast styles of presenting material. This approach will assist students to understand the impact on their motivation, interest, and learning, of how material is presented.

Course content differed from the content of other courses in ethnic psychology or cross cultural psychology as reviewed in catalogue course descriptions, course syllabi, or calls to instructors. Some courses focused on one specific ethnic group or outlined a historical perspective. Other courses focused on particular topical interests, such as cognitive processes, mental health, and attitudes and personality issues as they relate to understanding ethnic/racial differences. Other course approaches looked at methodological issues, ethical considerations, and the negative impact that empirical research conducted by university faculty had on ethnic people and communities from which the data was gathered. The content and structure of the class, by contrast, focused on accomplishments of each particular speaker, and gave students valuable insights into how speakers conceptualized research problems and developed strategies to study problems. Many speakers, in addition, addressed political issues that invariably impact what types of research is allowable in various agencies, and how research information might be used or misused to make budget and institutional policy decisions. The political nature of ethnic psychology was also addressed in obtaining grants and getting controversal psychological findings published in such areas as bilingual education, busing and desegration, and examining graduate training and its relationship to ethnic minorities. Course content, in summary, went beyond the traditional description of research and research findings and portrayed the lifestyle of an ethnic minority psychologist and realistic hazards and rewards in choosing psychology as a career.

Contact and Consulting with Students

Several observations were made in contact and consulting with students. Many students reported they had never had contact in the psychology classroom with a professor who was a minority group member. To have a course instructor and ten guests from ethnic groups was perhaps an overwhelming event for some. Some unconscious biases and prejudices surfaced during the course. One student

remarked that she didn't realize so much positive research had been conducted on ethnic groups. Other Caucasian students reported an unusual feeling being in a classroom where "they were outnumbered". Student contact with each other and class dynamics were also revealing. As each student staked out a territory, there was invariably little change in seating patterns and interaction. While this was helpful in determining attendance, it also highlighted another observation - there was little interaction between cultural groups.

Each student was required to make contact with the course instructor or teaching assistant to discuss approaches for their paper. Several female Black and Hispanic students confided to the instructor that, though it was their junior year, this was the first contact they had with any instructor during office hours. They further confided after several contacts that they felt their topic was inferior, not "up to par", or they confided that while excited by the content possibilities for a paper, they believed they did not have enough confidence in their skills and abilities to write a ten-page paper.

During contact with students it became apparent that little research had been conducted or reported in psychology journals on topic areas they selected. Casas (in press) has noted this difficulty and reviewed the frequency of articles dealing with racial, ethnic minorities in major journals. For the period of 1975 through 1981, he examined articles in major APA journals that focused on counseling and therapy. He reported no more than 4% of the articles for the period focused on ethnic/racial issues and concerns. He reported, for example, that the American Psychologist, the major journal used in the profession to address current issues, contained 14 out of 556 articles related to racial-ethnic minority concerns for the period. An additional problem reported by students was that major journals that focus on ethnic issues such as The Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, and the Hispanic Journal of the Behavioral Sciences were not available in the university library.

This lack of available resources necessitated the formation of a clearinghouse of information among students, instructors, and speakers. A networking system of information grew from the class as students shared resources. After completion of their required research papers, students were asked to present a 5-minute summary of the paper to the class to further encourage the networking system.

An outgrowth of the lack of library resources was that students requested books and journal subscriptions that were previously unknown to the library. Students also registered complaints on outdated, offensive, and potentially damaging materials discovered in the library. In short, they became better consumers of materials and active in helping the library respond to their needs.

Course Assessment for Grade Determination

Students enrolled in the course entered with a diverse range of ethnic/racial awareness and cultural sensitivity. A concern in the course was to encourage students to examine issues in ethnic psychology with a positive frame of reference and not a deficit feeling of not knowing cultural information. Student experiences may be deflating and nonproductive when exploring issues in ehtnic psychology if other students discount efforts made to understand class members' ethnic group needs.

Students were encouraged to talk about projects and feelings generated by the class to course instructors. Many of the frustrations became apparent and office hours were sometimes insufficient to meet student needs. Students did take advantage of the instructors' availability.

The concern for students, on the other hand, had to be balanced by developing a course that maintained a sophisticated level of content and was of sufficient complexity and value that it would not be viewed as a "joke" class. The

dilemma of responding to the range of student needs in a course and maintaining course credibility is an issue in undergraduate courses and especially an issue in courses in ethnic psychology. This reinforced the importance of developing course assessment criteria that were sensitive to student needs while also being rigorous enough to protect the integrity and acceptance of the course for the future. In assisting students to prepare for the final examination, for example, the instructor reviewed readings and lectures and highlighted material that was important and that would appear on the final examination. This procedure reinforced the idea that students would have a final examination that they could expect to be comprehensive and rigorous, but also one they could prepare for.

In terms of course projects, as previously discussed, students were required to meet with course instructors to conceptualize a project, review potential resources, and discuss creative ways to present the material. Students displayed a wide range of writing skills and ability to outline and develop a thesis. In addition, student knowledge of how to locate and examine psychological literature was diverse. Unfortunately, these skills and abilities are rarely discussed in classes to the degree that students feel uncomfortable and intimidated in writing a paper. Clearly for psychology instructors, it is a value to focus on the content of psychological material without teaching students how to organize and conceptualize papers. In the future, this issue must be further examined in exploring the role of the psychology instructor in course delivery.

One fact course instructors were well aware of as the class unfolded, was there was a range of motivation, skill level, and sophistication in students enrolled. Instructors were constantly battling with the idea of how do we individualize the class and take into account differential level of skills and growth and maintain a comparative basis where grading can be accomplished. This issue

in grade assessment is a growing dilemma and is confounded by informal data presented at a recent workshop (Vasquez, Note 4). Institutional data from the office of Admissions of a major university were presented that compared mean average academic results for specific undergraduate subgroups during the years 1977 through 1983. An order effect was discovered where mean average GPA's for Caucasian students hovered around 3.0, mean average GPA's for Asian students were around 2.9, and foreign mean average varied from 2.7 to 2.8, Chicano mean average GPA's clustered about 2.6, while American Indian's were lower, and Blacks hovered about 2.4. At no time did the overall averages for any group depart the noted order effect even though there was a trend for grade inflation. While data on variability were not cited it was revealing to see there was a strong caste effect as based on average GPA's. One potential conclusion is that these student groups as a whole have differential levels of skills. Another potential conclusion is institutional factors and factors of grading in courses may not take into account different learning styles of course participants. The issue is a complex one with immense political implications. Methods of assessment in classes must receive additional attention to understand conscious and unconscious patterns of grading as they relate to ethnic student performance. The relationship between grades received and ethnicity must receive additional attention to understand and assist ethnic/racial students' retention and production in classes, as well as professors understanding the impact of their courses on student performance and knowledge.

Student Characteristics and Course Evaluation

In planning the design of this course, instructors solicited information from various universities on their ethnic psychology courses. Departments and/or instructors provided syllabi with course content and structure. No university,

however, was able to provide demographic information on students who enrolled in ethnic psychology courses. Further, little information was obtained on student learning and impact of the course. These variables are important for course development and refinement. Moreover, as the number of psychology majors decreases and departments become more accountable for learning in an era of shrinking resources, it is essential to review characteristics of students in classes and better assess what is learned. This section presents student characteristics for one specific course in ethnic psychology, discusses students' course evaluations, and outlines instructor's evaluation of students.

Student Characteristics

To identify and examine student characteristics, a questionnaire was distributed on the first day of class (see Appendix B). Student ethnic breakdown did not vary significantly from the university's ethnic composition. Further, the ethnic distribution for the class did not vary from that of the department that sponsored the course. This is somewhat surprising because one might anticipate that a course high in ethnic content would attract a higher percentage of ethnic students. In reality it appears that a more diverse range of students see the potential benefit from the study of ethnic psychology. This further reinforces the need for a course not only for minority students' needs but for the interests of all students.

The course attracted a significantly higher number of females (81%). This statistic was of interest since the overall university population of female students equals approximately 54%. In reviewing departmental statistics, however, it was found that 71% of department undergraduates are female. Thus, to better meet student needs, it becomes important to consider topics focusing on the needs and interests of women.

Analysis of a personal identification question revealed some interesting findings. Instructions to the students were to report an ethnic identifier that was personally acceptable. A broad range of ethnic self-identifiers resulted. Very few students identified themselves in the same manner. For example, of the five Black students enrolled, two identified themselves as Black and Black-American, two categorized themselves as Negro, and one said he/she was Afro-American. Of the Latino/Hispanic students, the majority called themselves either Mexican-Americans or Mexicans (N=5). The other three preferred the title of Chicano. The Asians (N=5) included the nomenclature of Japanese-American, Philipino, etc. No one considered themselves "oriental" (which shows much political awareness on the students' part - oriental is not an acceptable title for people of Asian/Pacific Islander descent). It was concluded that ethnic/racial students at the college level are extremely heterogenous in terms of how they choose to identify themselves.

The White students reported a wider range of ethnic self-identifiers. Eleven of the 25 used the terms White or Caucasian in their self-descriptions. The remaining listed specitic ethnic backgrounds (i.e., Irish, German, European, etc.). For the most part, these students were pleased that their cultural beingness was acknowledged.

Another provocative item was that several women included their sex in their ethnic self-description. That is, such descriptions as Black woman or White woman were abundant. No male chose to use sex as a delineator, however.

Question #11 of the Student Questionnaire asked what expectations the students had for this course. The two categories receiving the largest responses were the expectations of the course making students more aware or sensitive to cultural differences and backgrounds (N=16) and the expectations of learning cultural differences as they relate to research and clinical interventions (N=15).

Students also wanted to understand the problems experienced by minorities (N=4) and have knowledge of recent research regarding minorities (N=4). Positive goals were expressed by both Caucasian and minority students. Students anticipated the course would help them get more in touch with personal ethnic identity or help them understand other ethnic groups.

Students' Course Evaluation

Two methods were used to assess student course evaluations. First, the standard departmental course evaluation was used to insure the course would be compared to other departmental offerings. Departmental evaluation results appear in Appendix C. Results indicate the course was reviewed highly by students. One measure, instructor enthusiasm and interest, received a perfect 7.0 with low standard deviation. Students were highly impressed with the instructor's strong interest in the course.

The second evaluation instrument was designed to obtain detailed feedback on the individual speakers. The lecturers were rated on a 7-point scale on their ability to communicate concepts, theories, and information clearly. With 7 being the highest possible rating, all the speakers averaged a mean of approximately 5 to 6. The students were very honest in their assessment and were solely concerned about the speakers' abilities to communicate to the class for the three-hour session.

Written, open-ended student responses further demonstrate student satisfaction and course success. Several representative responses include:

> "This course has stimulated my thinking enormously. Sometimes I tend to just follow along in class without ever really hearing things or digesting information. This class was different for me. Almost every Monday, I left class excited about what I had just heard and anxious to learn more. It's a great feeling that I don't experience often."
>
> "If this course didn't give me a sense of cultural understanding, nothing would have."

"I think the structure of the course was excellent and the excitement of the professor for his subject flowed over into the class. The department should consider structuring other courses similarly."

"I feel very priviledged to have partaken of this experimental course and besides hearing from the best lecturers/researchers I feel almost like a professional myself. You did a great job."

Instructor's Evaluation of the Students

As discussed earlier, three evaluation measures were utilized - attendance, a term paper, and the final examination to assign final grades. Overall attendance was high. Sixty-five percent of the students attended 9 or 10 sessions. Only one student missed more than three sessions.

The term paper was graded with a maximum of 35 points, scaled in the following manner:

thesis statement (style and organization) . .	7 points
literature review (adequate and related). . .	10 points
synthesis and discussion (application to class, self or society).	13 points
style and overall appearance	5 points

The range of points was 20 to 34 with a mean of 30, a mode of 32, and a median of 31. Paper results were positively skewed as a result of quality papers or the leniency of the instructor's grading. A recommendation for next year is to have more than one reader for the papers. In reviewing the titles of the papers, however, it is clear that the course stimulated much thought and creativity. Some of the topics included:

"Ethnic identity between successive generations of Japanese-Americans: the continuing process of acculturation and assimilation"

"World view of minority people: repeated experiences of helplessness and cultural influence"

"Bonds of an interracially mixed couple"

"The White minority"

"The social adjustment of South Vietnamese Refugees"

The grades on the final exam were also positively skewed with a mean of 27.4, a mode of 31.5 and a median of 28. This positive skew was not surprising to the instructor. By design, the final exam was intended to test students on materials that were highlighted in class. Since the lecturers varied in style and information, a review section was designed to help students prepare for the exam. Specific topic areas were highlighted and students were rewarded on the examination by paying specific attention to information highlighted by the instructor.

The overall course grade average was 3.1. Compared to the departmental average for upper division students, the 3.1 average is 0.2 to 0.4 grade points higher. The instructor's evaluation of the students' performance was higher than the departmental average. Similarly the students' evaluation of the instructor and the course were higher than the departmental average. Thus it appears that the instructor was just as pleased with his students as the students were pleased with him.

Overall, on all levels of evaluations, the course was highly successful. Minority and majority students received detailed academic and personal information from the course. The interactions among the students facilitated the learning process. The class was designed to stimulate understanding within and between cultures. Evaluations by the instructor and the students showed the course more than achieved these objectives.

Recommendations for Ethnic Psychology Undergraduate Courses

The following recommendations are intended as points of departure for future discussion about undergraduate courses in ethnic psychology:

1. The American Psychological Association must exercise affirmative leadership in assisting psychology departments to develop courses in ethnic psychology. Leadership might include projects from the Educational Affairs Office such as: a) conducting surveys that outline the current state of affairs in undergraduate ethnic psychology courses nationally; b) collecting and disseminating course descriptions and syllabi that detail specific formats for ethnic psychology courses; and c) sponsoring national and regional conferences to discuss issues related to development and delivery of ethnic psychology courses. Moreover, the Association must reaffirm the need to offer ethnic psychology courses and to integrate all psychology courses so that content is sensitive to individual and cultural differences among people. The Association must establish tangible guidelines that establish teaching of ethnic psychology as an ethical imperative.
2. Individual psychology departments must recognize the critical importance of an ethnic perspective in the undergraduate curriculum. Departments must be encouraged to develop innovative ways to create and deliver undergraduate courses in ethnic psychology. Collaborative efforts in local, regional, and national networking to utilize the talents of a limited pool of ethnic psychologists must be developed. Course work in ethnic psychology must be well publicized to students as an important part of their professional and personal growth. As teachers, psychology faculty must recognize the importance of including curriculum information

which details issues, research, and trends in ethnic psychology in every course offering. The infusion of ethnic sensitive course material, while not necessarily leading to promotion and tenure, must have a more basic ethical meaning as essential in its own right.

3. Psychology departments and individual faculty members must examine grading procedures to determine whether differential patterns of grade achievement exist among student groupings. Where such differential patterns exist, departments must critically assess reasons for the patterns. Departments must consider both differential skills and abilities of students and possible course and attitudinal barriers that impact grade patterns. Psychologists who teach must become more involved in not only imparting psychological knowledge, but in better understanding how student growth and needs can be best served.

4. In a concerted effort by faculty members and practitioners, the content base in ethnic psychology must be expanded to provide more extensive information. Stereotypic information and myths must be disspelled. Moreover, courses must include up-to-date information that is balanced and preserves the integrity of populations from which the research has been conducted.

5. Undergraduate students who are enrolled in psychology courses must take a more active role in their learning. Where courses do not present ethnic psychology course specific information, students must be taught the value of consulting with professors and department chairs without punative repercussions for students or faculty. Where course information is not readily available that focuses on ethnic psychology issues, such

as university libraries, students should voice concerns to proper university officials. Students must recognize the stimulus for change is often in their actions.

6. In regard to a specific course in ethnic psychology, the following recommendations should be considered:

   a. Courses in ethnic psychology should be carefully labeled so as not to be confused with sociological/anthropological courses in cross cultural psychology.

   b. Course format should be constructed so that a lecture-content section is balanced with a small group discussion portion. In small groups, heterogenous groups of students can meet to foster better understanding of material as it relates to them. This format will increase the probability of students understanding the impact of psychological information.

   c. Methods of assessing the impact of courses in ethnic psychology on students' attitudes and behaviors over a longer period of time must be developed. Do ethnic psychology courses help students better respond to others who are culturally different?

Overall, a coordinated and concerted effort between professional organizations, psychology departments and faculty, and students is needed to insure that psychology in the 1980's becomes responsive to the needs of the culturally different in regards to the undergraduate psychology curriculum.

Reference Notes

1. American Psychological Association. Report by the Task Force on Minority Education and Training for the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs. Washington, D. C.: Author, October, 1982.
2. American Psychological Association Educational Affairs Office. Results: Phase I Survey of Undergraduate Department Chairs. Washington, D. C. February, 1983.
3. American Psychological Association Educational Affairs Office. The Undergraduate Psychology Curriculum from an International Perspective: Selected Courses, Washington, D. C.:July, 1983.
4. Vasquez, J. A. Why Do Minority Students Perform at Lower Levels in School. Unpublished manuscript, 1982.

References

Albee, G.W. A Conference on Recruitment of Black and Other Minority Students and Faculty. American Psychologist, 1969, 24, 720-723.

American Psychological Association. Ethical Principles of Psychologists. American Psychologist, 1981, 36, 633-638.

Astin,A.W., Astin,H.S., Green,K.C., Kent,L., McNamara,P., and Williams,M.R., Minorities in American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Bernal,M.E. & Padilla,A.M. Status of Minority Curricula and Training in Clinical Psychology. American Psychologist, 1982, 37, 780-787

Casas, J.M. Policy, Training, and Research in Counseling Psychology: The Racial/Ethnic Minority Perspective in The Handbook of Counseling Psychology, R. Brown (ed.) (in press).

Cordes, C. Top Research Programs Preserve Reputations, National Survey Finds. APA Monitor, March, 1983, pp. 7-9, 32.

Hilliard, T.O. Professional Training and Minority Groups. In Levels and Patterns of Professional Training in Psychology, M. Korman (ed.) Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1976.

Jones, J.M. Watershed Year for APA's Minority Fellowship Program. APA Monitor, March, 1980, p.35.

Kennedy,C.D., & Wagner,N.N. Psychology and Affirmative Action: 1977, Professional Psychology, 1979, 10, 234-243.

Korman, M.(ed.) Levels and Patterns of Professional Training in Psychology. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1976.

National Board of Graduate Education. Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education. (Board report No. 5). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976.

Parham, W., & Moreland, J.R. Nonwhite Students in Counseling Psychology: A closer look. Professional Psychology, 1981, 12, 499-507.

References (contd.)

Ramirez, A. Ethnic Psychology: Toward a Liberating Psychology. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, New York, NY, 1979.

Russo, N.F., Olmedo, E.L., Stapp,J., and Fulcher,R. Women and Minorities in Psychology. American Psychologist , 1981, 36, 1315-1363.

Simpkins,G., & Raphael,P. Black Students, APA, and the Challenge of Change. American Psychologist, 1970, 5, XXI-XXVI.

Sue, S. Ethnic Minority Issues in Psychology: A Recommendation. American Psychologist, 1983, 5, 583-593.

Taylor, D.A., Ethnicity and Bicultural Considerations in Psychology: Meeting the needs of Ethnic Minorities, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1977.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population and Housing: Advanced Report, PHC, 80- -1, 1980.

Appendix A

List of Course Presenters

Dr. J. Manuel Casas

Dr. Jose Cervantes

Dr. John Garcia

Dr. Robert Guthrie

Dr. Christine C. Iijima Hall

Dr. Amado Padilla

Dr. Joe Pine

Dr. Daryl Rowe

Dr. Maria Nieto Senour

Dr. Stanley Sue

Dr. Dan Romero, Instructor

Ms. Leslie B. Minor, Teaching Assistant

APPENDIX B

Student Questionnaire

1. Name and Address:

2. Campus phone number:

3. Age:

4. Gender:

5. Grade Level:

6. Major:

7: Personal ethnic self descriptor:

_____

8. Other Psychology courses completed (list by name of course):

9. Geographic location where you have lived your first 18 years:

10. How would you define Cross Cultural Psychology:

11. What do you expect to learn from this course?

12. Do you have any specific issues, research questions, or personal questions about cross cultural psychology that you would like answered in the course?

APPENDIX C

COURSE EVALUATION SUMMARY

COURSE: S100A - CROSS CULT PSYCH
QUARTER: FALL 1982
INSTRUCTOR: ROMERO
ENROLLMENT: 43
NUMBER RESPONDING: 34

ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 7.

	THIS COURSE		COMPARISON TO OTHER COURSES: UPPER DIV.		ALL	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
ABOUT THE INSTRUCTOR:						
CLEARLY OUTLINED OBJECTIVES	6.7	(0.6)	5.9	(1.4)	6.0	(1.3)
EXHIBITED ENTHUSIASM/INTEREST	7.0	(0.2)	6.2	(1.1)	6.3	(1.0)
WAS ABLE TO COMMUNICATE	6.4	(0.9)	5.5	(1.6)	5.8	(1.4)
WAS AVAILABLE OUTSIDE OF CLASS	6.4	(1.4)	6.0	(1.3)	5.5	(1.7)
ENCOURAGED PARTICIPATION	6.8	(0.6)	6.0	(1.4)	5.7	(1.5)
SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO GRADE	6.4	(1.1)	5.9	(1.3)	5.7	(1.4)
GAVE CONSTRUCTIVE FEEDBACK	6.0	(1.8)	5.0	(1.9)	4.7	(2.0)
GENERAL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	6.2	(1.0)	5.6	(1.5)	5.8	(1.3)
ABOUT COURSE:						
OBJECTIVES CORRES. WITH OUTCOME	6.6	(0.8)	5.7	(1.4)	5.9	(1.2)
CLASSES WELL PREPARED/ORGANIZED	6.5	(0.8)	5.6	(1.5)	5.9	(1.3)
OUTSIDE WORK COMPLEMENTED CLASS	6.4	(1.1)	5.9	(1.4)	5.8	(1.4)
LABS/DISC. USEFUL	6.6	(0.8)	5.1	(1.8)	5.3	(1.7)
EMPHASIS ON UNDERSTANDING	6.3	(1.0)	5.6	(1.5)	5.5	(1.6)
STIMULATED THINKING & INTEREST	6.6	(1.1)	5.6	(1.6)	5.7	(1.5)
COURSE WAS EXTREMELY ENJOYABLE	6.0	(1.6)	5.2	(1.8)	5.3	(1.7)
WORK LOAD (1 = LIGHT)	4.9	(1.1)	5.1	(1.2)	4.8	(1.3)
OVERALL VALUE OF COURSE	6.2	(1.3)	5.4	(1.5)	5.5	(1.4)